



TWIA Catastrophe Modeler RFP Vendor Questions

All questions below are verbatim submitted from potential Respondents.

Q. Can I receive the responses submitted by vendors for the prior Catastrophe Modeling Services RFP?

A. The records from the previous Catastrophe Modeling RFP can be requested through our Public Information Act (PIA) inbox at RecordsRequest@twia.org. Please send your request to that email address, and someone from the PIA Request team will follow up with you.

Q. Can you also disclose the organizations represented by the advisors and third parties, if any, involved with the Evaluation Committee at this time?

A. All Evaluation Committee members are employees of the Texas Windstorm Insurance Association (TWIA). At this time, there are no identified advisors or third parties serving on the Evaluation Committee for this RFP. If advisors or third parties are identified in the future during the RFP process, we will disclose them on our webpage at twia.org/vendor-requests.

Model General / Selection / Methodology

Q. Can TWIA please explain the impetus for this effort? What specific perils to model? Does TWIA anticipate having more than one model? Does TWIA have preferred or historically relied-upon catastrophe models or model versions that respondents should include in their proposed approach? If multiple models are proposed, does TWIA expect a blended/view-of-risk approach, side-by-side results, or selection of a primary model? Approximately how many locations/risks are contained in the portfolio, and what are the expected portfolio file sizes? For “modeled expected losses by reinsured layer,” will TWIA provide the applicable reinsurance structures and terms, and does TWIA expect the selected vendor to apply those structures directly to modeled losses or only provide loss information for TWIA's downstream reinsurance analysis? Could TWIA clarify what is intended by “portfolio optimization analysis,” including the exposure classes and optimization objectives it expects the selected vendor to evaluate? What model documentation and validation information will TWIA require to support its internal governance, Board review, and regulatory interactions?

A. TWIA currently contracts with a third-party vendor to provide necessary catastrophe modeling services. TWIA has issued this RFP as part of its due diligence efforts to ensure that it continues to receive quality and reliable services at the best possible value to the Association. TWIA has historically modeled both hurricane and SCS perils. TWIA does not have preferred models but has consistently used multiple models to provide a broad range of estimates, including Verisk, RMS, Cotality RQE, and Impact Forecasting. The determination of whether and how to blend or select between the models has traditionally been made by the TWIA Board of Directors after reviewing side-by-side results. The most recently modeled portfolio contains approximately 293,000 locations and is approximately 65 MB in size. TWIA will provide layer attachment and exhaustion information for



reinsurance layers to be used in calculating the modeled expected loss within each layer. No application of reinsurance to individual risks or locations is necessary. Exposure classes will include, at a minimum, differentiation between residential and commercial policies but may include additional analysis based on other risk characteristics as supplied in the modeling exposure files. There are no pre-existing specific requirements for model documentation or validation beyond what is necessary to satisfy the vendor's own professional standards. Specific documentation or validation may be required upon request.

Historical Modeling Approach

Q. Can TWIA provide additional information regarding the catastrophe models, assumptions, methodologies, and adjustments used in its most recent 50-year PML determination and rate adequacy analysis?

A. Additional information on the most recent modeling process can be found on the TWIA website at <https://www.twia.org/about-us/financial-reports/2026-rate-adequacy-analysis/> including a summary of hurricane model input assumptions and both summary and detailed model outputs.

Definition of 1-in-50 PML

Q. For purposes of the 2027 funding structure, can TWIA clarify the required definition of the 50-year PML, including whether it expects occurrence or aggregate loss, treatment of demand surge, storm surge, loss amplification, secondary uncertainty, and any other required loss components?

A. There is no statutory definition of the 50-year PML beyond “the probable maximum loss for the association for a catastrophe year with a probability of one in 50.” The PML has historically been determined on an aggregate basis given the reference to “a catastrophe year” but other optional modeling specifications are subject to change based on Board decision with each determination.

Exposure Data Available

Q. Can TWIA describe the unit-level exposure data that will be made available to the selected respondent, including key fields, valuation information, construction attributes, geocoding quality, policy terms, and historical data completeness?

A. The attached exhibit provides the field names included in the most recent modeling exposure file. TWIA actively attempts to provide as complete a data set as possible and will work with the selected vendor to ensure that all exposure information is accurate and comprehensive, including the population of all applicable secondary modifiers.

Required Model Outputs / Deliverables

Q. Beyond the outputs identified in Section 2.1, can TWIA specify the anticipated loss metrics, return periods, perspectives, geographic aggregations, lines/classes of business, and financial views it expects to receive? What GIS and mapping deliverables does TWIA



expect - static maps, interactive visualization/dashboards, geospatial files/data, or analytical mapping outputs? Does TWIA expect direct access to the cat modeling platform/software, or is the requirement primarily for the selected vendor to perform model runs and deliver results and analysis? If direct access is desired, what workflows are anticipated (e.g., is API required)? For expert testimony, what level and frequency of support does TWIA anticipate, and what areas (e.g., model methodology, TWIA-specific results, rate adequacy, etc.) would testimony be expected to address?

A. Beyond the outputs identified in Section 2.1 of the RFP, the specific metrics, perspectives, etc. are flexible in nature. TWIA expects more detailed description of the information to be provided to be outlined in each vendor's response to the RFP. TWIA does not require direct access to modeling platforms. Expert testimony should be available and included in the response to the RFP, but there are no specific or pre-existing expectations that it will be necessary.

Rate Adequacy Deliverable

Q. For the 2027 rate adequacy analysis, what specific catastrophe-model outputs and level of granularity does TWIA require, and how will those outputs interface with TWIA's actuarial rate-making process?

A. Please refer to the 2026 Rate Adequacy Analysis webpage linked above for examples of how modeling output has been incorporated in the most recent rate analysis. Specifically, residential and commercial exhibits 7 and 10.

Deliverable Dates

Q. Can TWIA provide the target dates for delivery of the preliminary and final 50-year PML, reinsurance-related analytics, rate-adequacy outputs, and other major modeling deliverables?

A. The TWIA Board of Directors is expected to determine the methodology to be used in determining the 50-year PML for the following year at its November meeting, exposures are provided as of November 30, and modeling results and the resulting 50-year PML are presented and discussed at the February Board meeting. Documentation and additional information to be used as part of the rate adequacy analysis are expected to be available in the April-May timeframe.

Evaluation Criteria Weighting

Q. Can TWIA provide the relative weighting or scoring allocation among Experience and References, Clarity of Proposal, and Cost?

A. Experience and References and Cost are each weighted at 30%. Clarity (and content) of Proposal is weighted at 40%.

Best-Value Priorities

Q. Within the stated best-value evaluation, what characteristics of the catastrophe-modeling approach will TWIA consider most important—for example, technical



methodology, breadth of models, Texas coastal expertise, interpretability, responsiveness, technology, or cost?

A. There is no single, most important consideration as part of the best-value evaluation. Each of the factors listed should be expected to be included.

Sections 2.6 / 9.10 Clarification

Q. Sections 2.6 and 9.10 reference the “design and marketing of a risk transfer program.” Please confirm whether respondents to this catastrophe-modeling RFP are expected to perform or describe any risk-transfer marketing activities, or whether the requested schedule should instead address the catastrophe-modeling workstream supporting TWIA’s 2027 funding structure and rate adequacy analysis.\

A. The references to risk transfer are in error. Respondents will not be involved in any risk-transfer activities, and these references should instead address the catastrophe modeling workstream supporting TWIA’s annual funding structure and rate adequacy analysis.

Information Sharing

Q. Given the proprietary nature of catastrophe models, which modeling outputs (e.g., average annual loss, probable maximum loss, event loss set, etc.) and at what level of granularity (e.g., location, ZIP code, county, state, etc.) would be disclosed publicly as part of this engagement?

A. Please refer to the 2026 Rate Adequacy Analysis webpage linked above for examples of catastrophe modeling outputs that are regularly published on the TWIA website. Please refer to section 4.1 of the RFP for additional information on potential disclosures under the Texas Public Information Act; this information would also apply to delivered vendor work product under this engagement.

Additional Information Provided by TWIA:

TWIA Exposure File Fields

POLICY_NUMBER
RISK_NUMBER
BUILDING_NUMBER
STATE
ZIP_CODE
COUNTY
CITY
STREET_ADDRESS
SITE_LIMIT
BUILDING_LIMIT
BUILDING_VALUE
BUILDING_DEDUCTIBLE
APPURTENANT_STRUCTURES_LIMIT
APPURTENANT_STRUCTURE_VALUE



APPURTENANT_STRUCTURES_DEDUCTIBLE
CONTENTS_LIMIT
CONTENTS_VALUE
CONTENTS_DEDUCTIBLE
TIME_ELEMENT_LIMIT
TIME_ELEMENT_VALUE
TIME_ELEMENT_DEDUCTIBLE
WIND_EXCLUDED
EARTHQUAKE_ENDORSED
CONSTRUCTION_CLASS
OCCUPANCY_TYPE
CLASS_CODE
CLASS_CODE_2
SQUARE_FOOTAGE
NUMBER_OF_STORIES
YEAR_BUILT
ROOF_YR
ROOF_AGE
STRUCTURE_CONDITION_CD
ROOF_TYPE
MOD_BLDG_CREDIT
TERRITORY
HAIL_RESISTANCE_ROOF_CD
HAIL_RESISTANCE_ROOF_INSTALLED_YR
WPI8_WAIVER_FL
RISK_COUNT
Z_PC7_POL_NO